

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 12-14 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 96/07941 A1 (“WO ‘941”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth in the Response filed November 29, 2005, and the following additional reasons.

The present invention is directed to a polarizing plate comprising a polarizing layer having a thickness of about 20 nm to about 1500 nm formed by rubbing at least one surface of a substrate, coating the rubbed surface of the substrate with an aqueous solution containing a dye having a tabular molecular shape, and drying the solution, wherein the dye having a tabular molecular shape coated on the rubbed surface of the substrate is oriented roughly perpendicular to the rubbing direction.

WO ‘941 discloses that the dye is oriented parallel to the rubbing direction; however, it does not describe that the dye is oriented perpendicular to the rubbing direction. That is, WO ‘941 does not anticipate the present invention.

Further, to the extent Ignatov et al might be relied upon, Ignatov et al may disclose that the dye lies in planes that are roughly perpendicular to the substrate but not the rubbing direction. Therefore, Ignatov et al does not rectify the deficiencies of WO ‘941.

For the Examiner's consideration, Applicants attach hereto figures to illustrate the schematic views of the present invention, WO '941 and Ingnotov et al.

In view of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that there are no reasonable grounds in concluding that the tabular molecules in the embodiments described in WO '941 are oriented *roughly perpendicular to the rubbing direction*. Therefore, WO '941 does not anticipate the present invention. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

II. Response to Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 12-14 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent 6,965,473.

Applicants submit that the claims of the '473 patent do not render obvious the invention of the present claims as described above, and thus request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/758,119

Attorney Docket Q79461

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 22, 2006